

**REMARKS**

Claims 12, 15-17, 19, and 22-24, and amended claims 1-11, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, and 25 are in this application.

In section 4 on page 2 of the present Office Action, the Examiner stated that the "information disclosure statement filed 12/23/2004 fails to comply . . . because the reference 'JP-2001-319267-A is a foreign reference with no corresponding English translation." With regard thereto, it is respectfully submitted that an application (i.e., U.S. 2001/0044675) was identified in the 12/23 IDS as being an English counterpart to JP-2001-319267-A. Additionally, a supplemental IDS will be filed directed to JP-2001-319267-A which will include an English abstract thereof.

The disclosure was objected to because of an informality. In particular, the Examiner stated that in line 2 of page 2 the term "a factor" should be changed to "a factory". In response, line 2 on page 2 of the present application has been amended herein so as to incorporate the change suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner stated the lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors and requested the applicants' cooperation in correcting any errors of which the applicants may become aware. The applicants' undersigned attorney has corrected errors herein which he is currently aware of.

Claims 1-4, 7-14, 17, 18, 19-21, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0044675 A1 (Mastsumoto et al.).

Each of independent claims 1 and 9-11 has been amended herein. As a result and as an example, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"An image display apparatus, comprising:

a plurality of central processing units; and

. . .

said plurality of central processing units including:

a main control unit operable to control another of said plurality of central processing units to cause software read from a recording medium to be stored in a particular one of said plurality of storage units, said particular one of said plurality of storage units being selected by said main control unit, said another of said plurality of central processing units being associated with a portion of said plurality of storage units that includes said selected one of said plurality of storage units;

said another of said plurality of central processing units including:

first acquisition means . . .;

request means . . .;

second acquisition means . . .; and

storage control means . . . ." (Emphasis added.)

It is believed that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1 (and to claims 9-11). With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to Fig. 1 (in particular, elements 1, 11, and 31 thereof) and page 10, lines 9+ of the present application.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 pertains to an image display apparatus which comprises a plurality of central processing units (CPUs). (Emphasis added.) The plurality of central processing units include a main control unit and another of the plurality of central processing units includes first acquisition means, request means, second acquisition means, and storage control means.

It is respectfully submitted that Mastsumoto as applied by the Examiner does not appear to specifically disclose the above-identified features of claim 1 as amended herein. In support thereof, and as an example, in describing the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner appears to indicate that figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 0025 and 0028 of Mastsumoto disclose a plurality of control units. (See section 8, lines 4-5 of the present Office Action.) Initially, it is submitted that Fig. 1 Mastsumoto illustrates a control system for a vending machine which appears to include a main control apparatus 100, a coin identification apparatus 200, a display apparatus 300, and a remote controller 400, in which the main control apparatus, the display apparatus, and the remote controller each appear to have a display section. Additionally, the afore-mentioned portions of Mastsumoto relied on by the Examiner do not appear to indicate that the display apparatus 300 or any of the display sections includes a plurality of central processing units having a main control unit and another with first acquisition means, request means, second acquisition means, and storage control means.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is distinguishable from Mastsumoto as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those previously described with regard to claim 1, it is also

respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 9-11 are also distinguishable from Mastsumoto as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 2-4, 7, 8, 12-14, and 17, 18, 19-21, 24, and 25 are dependent from one of the amended independent claims. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-4, 7, 8, 12-14, and 17, 18, 19-21, 24, and 25 are distinguishable from Mastsumoto as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 22, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) unpatentable over Mastsumoto et al. in view of EP 0 844 556 A2 (Namikawa).

Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 22, and 23 are dependent from one of the amended independent claims. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 22, and 23 are distinguishable from Mastsumoto as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described. The Examiner does not appear to rely on Namikawa to overcome the above-described deficiencies of Mastsumoto. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 22, and 23 are distinguishable from the combination of Mastsumoto and Namikawa applied by the Examiner.

As it is believed that all of the objections and rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 10/519,088

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-314

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 16, 2009

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Dennis M.  
Smid, Esq./  
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.  
Registration No.: 34,930  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1102710\_1.DOC